DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 358 877 JC 930 307

AUTHOR Cohen, Arthur M.
TITLE Celebrating Transfer: A Report of the Annual Transfer Assembly (4th, Northbrook, IL, June 3-4, 1993).
INSTITUTION Center for the Study of Community Colleges, Los Angeles, Calif.
PUB DATE Jun 93
NOTE 21p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Credits; *College Role; *College Transfer Students; Community Colleges; Curriculum; *Definitions; *Educational Research; Liberal Arts; Student Educational Objectives; *Transfer Policy; Two Year Colleges; Two Year College Students
IDENTIFIERS Center for the Study of Community Colleges CA

ABSTRACT

The Center for the Study of Community Colleges (CSCC) in Los Angeles, California has examined transfer data for students at two-year institutions from 1984 through 1987. In the CSCC studies, transfer rates are calculated by dividing the number of students entering a community college with no prior college experience and completing at least 12 units into the number of these students who take one or more classes at a university within 4 years. Extrapolations from 1987 data show that about 1.25 million students entered the nation's 968 public community colleges in 1987, of whom 573,000 completed at least 12 units and just under 130,000 transferred within 4 years, for a transfer rate of 23%. CSCC has also conducted research on the community college curriculum, finding that, in 1991, liberal arts courses accounted for 56% of total credit offerings in two-year colleges. Other CSCC research indicates that state university systems with higher credit transferability for two-year college non-liberal arts courses show markedly higher student transfer rates. Given the increases in four-year college tuition, the greater numbers of college-age students, and the growing interest in the transfer function among two-year college staff, transfer rates can be expected to increase in coming years. Issues of transfer in Washington and North Carolina, relations between two- and four-year institutions, transfer rate calculations, uses of data, and tracking transfer retrospectively are also discussed in this report. A 12-item bibliography and a transfer rate data form are attached. (PAA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED358877

Celebrating Transfer

Arthur M. Cohen

A Report of the Fourth Annual Transfer Assembly, Northbrook, IL, June 3-4, 1993.

JC 930 307

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A. Cohen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CELEBRATING TRANSFER
Arthur M. Cohen

A report of the Fourth Annual Transfer Assembly, Northbrook, IL, June 3-4, 1993

Part I: Introductory Comments

This Transfer Assembly provides an opportunity for us to report on the work that the Center for the Study of Community Colleges has been doing to track transfer rates in community colleges across the nation. More than that, it allows us to celebrate the community colleges' activities on behalf of enhancing opportunities for people to progress toward the baccalaureate. Many community college spokespersons have emphasized the alternative education that the colleges provide: community uplift, community service, contract training for business, and the like. But as we have pointed out repeatedly, the community colleges are still major players in the progress of students through the graded system. They serve as grades thirteen and fourteen for a large number of people making the transition from high school to postsecondary education.

At the Center we have verified this lower division role by analyzing curriculum, the movement of students, the activities of the faculty, and the transfer rates. Since 1974 we have collected data on the humanities, sciences, social sciences, liberal arts, and all the rest of the curriculum. We have studied patterns of faculty functioning and of student aspirations and ability. We have worked with the Ford Foundation on the Urban Community Colleges Transfer Opportunities Program (UCCTOP) and, stemming from that involvement, we undertook the project that is the topic of discussion.

Definition and Data: At the Center we have defined a way of calculating transfer rates that can be applied consistently across the nation. After interacting with data compilers in numerous states and colleges we settled on a valid definition, one for which

data might reasonably be collected. The definition is: *all students entering the community college in a given year who have no prior college experience and who complete at least 12 college-credit units, divided into the number of that group who take one or more classes at the university within four years.* The reason for including the requirement of "no prior college experience" is to take the reverse transfers out of the database. We included the notation "at least 12 college credit units" to remove the casual drop-in who has taken but a course or two and for whom the colleges had no effect; we especially wanted to exclude those who had been admitted to universities as freshmen and who stop by the community college to take a class in the summer. The requirement of transfer *within four years* is an arbitrary cut-off, necessary because the transfer rate should be calculated in time for the colleges to estimate the effects of interventions that they have made on behalf of that function. In general the definition was effected so that it would be readily understandable to newspaper reporters, legislative aides, and anyone interested in transfer rates. It was important to not load in so many complexities that few people would bother to consider all permutations.

In order to collect the data we created a simple transfer rate data form (appended) which includes three lines. The first asked how many students entered the college in the fall of a given year with no prior college experience, listed by ethnic categories. The second line asked the data compiler to enter the number of that group who completed twelve units at the college. And the third line asked how many of the group who did complete twelve units enrolled at a four-year college or university within four years. We asked also for a note on how the data were collected.

We sent this form to samples of community colleges across America asking for data on students entering in 1984 and 1985. The samples were comprised of those colleges with high proportions of minority students because Ford is particularly interested in that group. In the third year of the project we sent the form to every community

college in the nation and in the fourth year we targeted particularly the state level data compilers.

The response was varied. Few community colleges on their own are able to collect all the data. They can fill in lines one and two but they must solicit information for line three from the universities to which their students transfer. Some, because of the strength of their experience and their affiliation with other institutions or because of their own interest and energy, are able to collect these data, but most cannot.

By soliciting the data from the state agencies we were able to expand the number of participating colleges so that for the cohort entering in 1987 we received complete data from all or most of the community colleges in fourteen states. By including single colleges from other states, the institutions enrolling more than forty percent of the community college students in the nation were participating. Interestingly the percentage of entrants receiving twelve units within four years and the percentage of transfer have remained consistent even as the sample has expanded. The data are is as follows.

Number of Participating Colleges	Year Students Entered	Number of Entrants	Percent Receiving 12 or More Credits within Four years	Percent Transferring within 4 Years
48	1984	77,903	50.5	23.7
114	1985	191,748	46.7	23.6
155	1986	267,150	46.7	23.4
366	1987	507,757	46.9	22.6

In summary there are 968 public community colleges in the United States and an extrapolation from our sample shows that about 1 1/4 million students entered those colleges in the fall of 1987. Of those, 573,000 completed twelve or more units and just under 130,000 transferred within four years.

We have presented these data at several meetings and been faced with the question, "Do your data suggest that community colleges are doing a good job?" At first I would hedge and say, "Well, good is relative. I don't know whether a 23 percent transfer rate is good. It is certainly better than 20 percent but not as good as 30 percent." But recently I have begun saying that I think that the community colleges are indeed doing a good job because 130,000 young people who entered college in the fall of 1987 and who subsequently enrolled in universities might not have had the opportunity for university attendance had it not been for the community colleges. I know that 130,000 does not look like a large number when compared with the 1.25 million students who entered for the first time but it is considerably larger than the number who would have made it to the university if the community college had not been there to give them their start.

To elaborate that latter point, a few prominent researchers recently have noted that if the universities had been open to those 1.25 million students originally a lot more would have gone on toward the baccalaureate. But that is a large, "if." In most states the option of university attendance is not available to students who have marginal high school records. University tuition is higher than community college tuition, thus university attendance is not open to many low income people. Furthermore many universities discourage part-time attendance and most community college students attend part-time because of work or other responsibilities. One more point: community colleges are available within commuting distance, allowing students to attend college without having to establish new residential arrangements. For all these reasons the community is providing opportunity for large numbers of people and our data verify that fact.

The data on the opportunity provided by community colleges were confirmed by our studies of curriculum. When we began the curriculum studies in the late 1970's the liberal arts accounted for 52 percent of the total credit course offerings. In 1991 the liberal arts accounted for 56 percent, organized as follows:

Discipline	No. Sections	% of Total Curriculum
Humanities	14,034	13.42%
English	13,327	12.75%
Math and Computer Sciences	11,176	10.69%
Sciences	8,031	7.68%
Social Sciences	6,966	6.66%
Fine & Performing Arts	5,671	5.42%
TOTAL	59,205	56.62%

These data were derived by counting every course listed in the Spring 1991 class schedule in a sample of 164 community colleges, more than 100, 000 classes overall. We counted the classes from the schedule, not the catalog, because these are the courses that are actually offered. We verified the offerings by checking on course cancellations and average class sizes in order to derive these figures.

Here again, as we have been reporting these data, we have encountered a measure of skepticism from people whose beliefs have been challenged. For many years community college spokespersons have been emphasizing the institutions' occupational role, its vocational and technical courses, its contributions to workforce development. Therefore when we present data on the Liberal Arts curriculum and on patterns of student transfer, those who have filed away the community college as a vocational training center are incredulous. Their preconceptions have been conditioned by several forces: community college leaders who choose to emphasize workforce development because they feel they can derive state support more readily for that function; university-based academic snobs who contend that community colleges cannot provide a satisfactory lower division experience; and, not least, academic researchers who are determined to prove that

the minority students who enroll in community college in greater numbers relative to their total student population than in the universities are getting short changed. The latter insist that the minorities who go to community colleges enter a cul de sac in their academic progression, that they are tracked into non-collegiate areas, that the community college is a dead-end for them. Our data on curriculum and transfer show that those allegations are quite overdrawn.

Even in the portions of the curriculum that are designated as occupational or vocational entry, transfer possibilities are present. In California for example the Non-Liberal Arts (Business, Health, Trade and Industry, Technologies) can be used by students wishing to transfer. Around 62 percent of those courses will transfer to the institutions in the California State University system and 29 percent to the University of California. Not incidentally, this large disparity in the non-transferability of Non-Liberal Arts classes to the two sectors also counts for the greater transfer of students from community colleges to CSU than to UC.

Transferability of California Non-Liberal Arts Courses

Transfer Subject Area	CSU	UC
Agriculture	64.5%	21.0%
Business & Office	61.0%	23.0%
Marketing & Distribution	70.3%	1.6%
Health	54.3%	16.3%
Home Economics	47.1%	12.9%
Technical Education	52.8%	11.0%
Engineering Technology	62.6%	5.7%
Trade & Industry	35.7%	3.7%
Personal Skills & Avocational Courses	88.0%	76.7%
Education	70.6%	5.6%
Other	94.1%	35.3%
Overall Transferability	**61.7%**	**28.9%**

We also checked course transferability comparing the University of Texas at Austin with Southwest Texas State University and a few other comprehensive institutions and found

that 42 percent of the community colleges' Non-Liberal Arts classes transferred to the comprehensive universities and 35 percent to the University of Texas. (This may be one reason why student transfer rates are higher in Texas than in California.) We did the same for Illinois, checking the transferability of courses to Illinois State University and to the University of Illinois at Urbana. Illinois State accepts 80 percent of the Non-Liberal Arts courses whereas the University of Illinois takes only 16 percent, a disparity between sectors even greater than those in California. And of course in Illinois transfer rates to Illinois State are much higher than to the University of Illinois. These types of analyses suggest the value of a consistent database in curriculum and in transfer rates.

In looking at the transfer rates for minority students we found, as expected, that the transfer rates are different for the different ethnic groups. Whereas the overall transfer rate is 23 percent, it is 25 percent for White and Asian students and 16 percent for Black and Hispanic students. No surprises there but we also discovered that the transfer rates for individual institutions in the same state are quite disparate; in California they range from 4 to 40 percent and the other states similarly show wide differences. The average gap is 29 percent between the transfer rates of the highest and the lowest college in the same state. In looking at the colleges with the highest transfer rates we found that Black and Hispanic students also transfer out of those colleges at a rate higher than the average. In brief, a college with a high transfer rate has a high transfer rate for everybody. The same pattern held for colleges at the low end; institutions from which few students transfer depress transfer rates for students of every ethnicity.

This point about differential transfer rates, with high transfer rate colleges transferring greater numbers of minority as well as majority students deserves elaboration. The community colleges have expanded opportunity for people to matriculate in higher education. The key to that expansion is lower tuition, acceptance of part-time attendance, forgiveness for past academic sins, and, not least, location. By placing the community colleges within commuting distance of everyone, attendance is made quite easy. But the

ubiquity of community colleges is not matched by the availability of public universities. A college in a California desert community will attract people who would not otherwise consider higher education attendance. But if there is no State University campus within a hundred miles of that community, few students will progress beyond the community college. Isolation is an inhibitor to transfer and it affects students of every ethnicity and socio-economic level.

A second depressant is the perception of the community college. If a college has consistently publicized its contract training, low-skill job preparation, and short term adult studies over a period of years, in effect discouraging transfer oriented students from attending, it will have a low transfer rate. Similarly a college with a reputation as a starting place for a baccalaureate will have a higher transfer rate. The latter college will have clearly stated articulation agreements with local universities such that perspective students know that they can get the first two years of a specific baccalaureate program at a considerably lower cost than they would have to pay for those two years at the university. In both examples, the messages sent by the colleges are important.

The distance to a university campus is clearly an influence. The community college and state university in the same town will often have curriculum articulation agreements, course equivalency notations, and counselors and faculty working part-time in both institutions, thus effecting a strong link between the two. Universities offering courses at night and welcoming part-time students as well as upper division state universities such as those in Illinois, Texas, and Washington also enhance transfer.

In addition to publicizing what the community colleges do for people beginning postsecondary studies, other uses for the data can be found. We send the individual college transfer rate to the data compilers who supplied them to us along with the statewide data for that college's area. Many of the data compilers are eager to compare their institutions with others in the state and when their college shows a higher transfer rate they tend to release that information to their local newspapers. Some of them also try

to go back in the file and find out whether students who took English from Ms. Smith are more likely to transfer than those who took the same course from Mr. Alvarez. But we don't do those types of comparisons and we don't release the data from any single college to anyone except for the people within that college.

Some of the more useful ways of applying the data are to monitor the effects of various programs. If the college has introduced a transfer center or some other major initiative the data trackers may be able to find out at least inferentially what the effect was. Special programs for special groups can also be monitored. For example," Did our transfer rate for Hispanic students go up because we have made a special effort to recruit transfer bound Hispanic students and to provide them with specific services?" A set of data collected consistently over the years is essential for answering such questions.

We plan on continuing tracking transfer rates for the next couple of years and on collecting the data during this coming year for the 1988 entrants. We could reduce the sample size because the data are consistent regardless of the number of colleges that we put in. However we are not collecting the data just for statistical analysis but also by way of publicizing what the colleges are doing on behalf of transfer. Accordingly we want to involve as many data compilers and interested staff members in as many colleges as possible.

The Future of Transfer: Over the next few years we are anticipating an increase in transfer rates because of several conditions that will affect them. For one, the universities that have budgetary problems are cutting back on the number of freshmen that they are taking in, thus forcing people beginning higher education to go into the community colleges. This group will include a great number of transfer-bound students. The budget limitations have also caused the universities to increase their tuition rates, which again will force many capable students into the community colleges where they can obtain the first two years toward their Baccalaureate at a lower cost. This same cost factor is causing additional scrutiny in states that are attempting to hold down the rising

costs of higher education in general and are thus putting increasing pressure on the colleges and universities to effect better articulation arrangements.

Budget constraints will also have an effect on transfer-related activities. In contrast to the 1970s when the colleges could set up new programs and find supplemental state funding for them, the 1990s are seeing a limitation on new state moneys. As the colleges settle back into their major functional areas of job entry, career upgrading, pre-Baccalaureate studies, and basic literacy preparation, transfer rates will increase as the peripheral activities decrease. However, English as a Second Language has been the most rapidly expanding area of the curriculum for several years and shows no sign of abating. Whether or not the courses are offered for transfer credit they represent a major effort on the part of the colleges that are assisting limited English speakers to enter the workforce and into American society in general.

The increase of the number of 18 year-olds in the American population that began a couple of years ago and will continue through 2003 will also effect higher transfer rates. The 18 year-olds are the traditional transfer students and as greater numbers of them appear, the median age of the community college student population will decrease and the transfer rate will increase.

And last, the community college staff members' interest in transfer as a central institutional function has grown as they realize that funding is not available for marginal activities and that full-time staff members who entered the institution with the idea of working in the transfer program remain on staff even as the part-timers and those who are employed for special program activities are dismissed. This has a salutary effect on every thing from student recruitment to counseling to curriculum to articulation agreements, all of which are necessary to keep the transfer function in its prominent place. In summation, the 1990s will be a popular decade for those who are committed to the transfer function.

Part II: Closing Comments

This Transfer Assembly has succeeded because of the enthusiasm for transfer and data collection exhibited by the people from Illinois, the premier group in terms of data collection and analysis on a statewide basis. We have celebrated transfer as one of the two major missions of the community college: preparing people to go on to the baccalaureate and preparing people for entry into the workforce. The community colleges were organized first in Illinois at the turn of the century and baccalaureate entry was their primary mission. It has thrived since then because of the cooperative arrangements between the colleges and the universities here.

In highlighting a few of the comments that have been made at this Assembly I can point to the following.

David Habura mentioned that the universities in Washington will accept the associate of arts degree as indicating that the student has met general education requirements for the baccalaureate and will even take up to fifteen hours of occupational study for transfer credit. All students with associate degrees are essentially guaranteed admission to the university. He mentioned also that the enrollment caps that have been imposed in Washington since the early 1980s have led the colleges to squeeze out the late matriculants and the part-time students, and at the same time have encouraged the universities to raise their expectations for student G.P.A. The result has been a younger student body and heightened transfer rate.

At the opposite extreme, Gary Barnes gave a report on North Carolina. Transfer rates in North Carolina are among the lowest, primarily because the community colleges were vocational training institutes originally and transfer functions were slow to develop. Furthermore the University of North Carolina has fourteen branch campuses and is considerably more accessible than the universities in most other states. The Washington and North Carolina difference and the reasons for it show one of the important uses to which a consistent database can be put.

Dick Fonte mentioned numerous issues that should be considered in assessing transfer rate variations. Some of these are length of time to transfer, types of curriculum that the students follow, student aspirations, and student abilities, issues that have been raised previously by other researchers and practitioners who have reacted to our transfer rate definition and data. Our comment is that the definition is as detailed as possible for collecting data uniformly across all the states. Student aspirations are not reliable nor are they collected in common manner. Many, and in some instances, most occupational courses are acceptable for transfer; not every state segregates vocational and pre baccalaureate courses the way Illinois does. We will check again on the length of time to transfer but a preliminary sample of that dimension has found that by allowing five years, instead of four before a student transfers, between one and two percentage points would be added to the overall rate. We have provided a forum and a general transfer rate calculation; the nuances that Fonte mentioned can be pursued subsequently by researchers in the individual institutions who have access to additional data.

Judith Eaton mentioned the need for aggressive, positive relations between community colleges and universities because transfer must be pursued vigorously. These relationships can center around cooperative teaching arrangements, mutual accountability, cooperation and cordiality in all areas, joint responsibility, and interpersonal relations. She echoed the comments that David Habura made regarding the faculty exchange procedure that has been formalized in Washington. And Ken Walker mentioned how the offering of upper division courses on community college campuses, either through faculty exchange or through video or other interactive technology, can bring community colleges and universities together. Community college staff members are interacting with university groups in many ways. Community college instructors offer remedial work on university campuses and university faculty teach upper division courses on community college campuses. These types of interactions enhance interinstitutional cooperation and, eventually, transfer rates.

Trudy Bers commented on the permutations that make transfer rate calculation difficult. Students attend community colleges and universities co-terminously and they attend one institution or another successively. Furthermore, as she pointed out, some students just transfer credits from one institution to another whereas other students are psychologically and intellectually students on one campus even as they attend classes and obtain credits on the other. Assigning responsibility for student progress is difficult. No single database can provide insight.

Other questions have arisen here that cannot be readily answered. Gary Barnes raised the question of determining which is the sending institution: the one last attended or the one at which the student earned the most credits? A student might take 50 units from college X, move to college Y and take three units, and then go to a university. Which is the sending institution? Some questions cannot be answered from datasets.

The Transfer Assembly definition considers the institution at which a student first enrolled the institution of record. We have to start somewhere and the college at which the students received their first involvement with postsecondary studies seems a good place. Granted that students move around from one institution to another, attending "incidentally," as Clifford Adelman suggests or "swirling" as the Phoenix people describe it, or in the form of a "marble cake" as Trudy Bers mentioned, some definition must be set forth. Students in America's graded education system do attain high school diplomas, associate degrees, baccalaureate degrees, masters degrees, and so on. This is a way of keeping score; it is not an absolute reflection of the realities of student attendance. Similarly our way of calculating transfer rates is a score-keeping mechanism; it by no means accounts for all the ways that students participate in postsecondary study.

Jim Holton raised an interesting question about the uses of data. As he put it, when asked about how many students transfer from his institution, he has been accustomed to saying, "A lot." When asked where they go, he has said, "Many places." And in response to the question of how well they do, he has responded, "Very well." In

Maryland where statewide data were once available but are no longer easily attainable, those responses may be temporarily acceptable. But we hope for more and we hope for better data from Maryland.

Issues of quality have also been mentioned. The number of transfers may be high but what is the quality? How well do the students do? These are separate issues and as long as the legislatures and the public in general perceive public education as a cumulative, graded, credit-bearing, degree-directed enterprise, questions of quality, accountability, and productivity will be raised. Similarly, as long as the community colleges pride themselves on the number of students who attend, and are funded on the basis of student attendance, they will tend to keep score in their own way. At bottom is the issue of who is counting? What are the definitions? Are the colleges keeping score on the basis of the number of people matriculating or on the number graduating? Is transfer considered a measure of institutional value? Our Transfer Assembly activities are designed to obviate the response that says, "Since we cannot account for all possible permutations of student attendance, aspirations, and ability, let us count nothing. Since we cannot measure the college's effect on the students who started, attended part time, declared transfer intent on one registration form, dropped out for a half year, got a job, quit the job, came back, joined the army, got married, decided they didn't want to take a remedial class, went into a vocational program, showed up at a university five years later, and so on, then let us not be accountable." Those types of rationalizations by way of emphasizing the complexities of student accounting are really just excuses similar to the one that has been used by the presidents who say, "You want to know how well our students do? Let me tell you about one." It is no more worthy to say that since we cannot account for everything let us account for nothing, than it is to use anecdotal data. Both reveal an unwillingness to take accountability for what the colleges do.

Jim Palmer mentioned how we can track transfer retrospectively by looking at the transcripts of baccalaureate recipients to see how many credits they brought into the

university from the community college that they attended. The analyses of the high school class of 1972 function in that form. They track student attendance through all types of institutions and show how as the students received degrees, they used credits earned in a variety of places. Both the baccalaureate retrospective and the longitudinal follow-up of a high school class of twenty years ago demand two things. The first is a credible and accessible database and the second is a response that does not confound the issue.

In the conduct of the Assembly we have been confronted with the difference between credible and accessible. A number of state agency officials have said that they have the data but that for one reason or another they cannot provide them. We have learned that schools are required by law to keep ethnic data but that the law does not require them to provide those data to us. More than half the states have credible databases, but only one-third of them seem inclined to provide them to an agency that has no authority to demand them.

Past the issues of credibility and accessibility are questions of confounding. For example, in response to the question, "What's a igloo?" We can respond, "An igloo is a dome-shaped dwelling made of blocks of ice with a tunnel for an entrance that is used occasionally as a temporary residence in the winter by the indigenous peoples of the Arctic Circle." That's a good place to begin if you are preparing an article for an encyclopedia. It's not a good answer if you are responding to a question posed by a five year old. When we describe transfer rates, some answers are good and some are not so good. Trying to account for all the permutations of the way that the students use the institutions and who they are and what they want and what courses they take are not good answers when you are trying to describe the community college to a lay audience. Newspaper readers, state legislators, and indeed, many university staff members are naive when it comes to describing community college accomplishments. The concepts of occasional attendance, aspirations, curriculums followed, drop-in and out, simultaneous involvement in various institutions, and the like, are like concepts of Arctic Circle, tunnel, blocks of ice, dome

shaped, and indigenous peoples. A five year old may only want to know that an igloo is "a round ice house." Most people may only want to know that the community college transfers around 25 percent of the people who enter in a given year. More than that is more than the situation demands.

Questions of the definition that we have been using have been raised and we will continue considering them. But we have difficulty accommodating them. For example, subdividing the file by student aspirations comes up repeatedly. The data are just not there. Student aspiration questions are asked in various ways and students change their aspirations from registration to registration. How shall we count the student who says, "I plan on transfer" at the first registration and "I plan on job entry," at the second registration? Or vice versa. Similarly the issue of the types of courses that students take brings up all sorts of difficult responses. Many occupationally designated courses are transferable. And what shall we do with the student who takes one course in transfer English and a second course in Small Business Management in the same term? Or the student who takes a history course and a keyboarding course? Student aspirations and course-taking behavior are both too mercurial to consider in a project of this type. And many career programs are more selective than the transfer programs; nursing, dental hygiene, high tech, for example. Those types of programs are designed to lead students from community college attendance directly into the baccalaureate. How can we leave those students out of the database?

Some programs that are designed to enhance transfer have been mentioned here. Rich Valencia commented on transfer center operations. Transfer centers provide information to students and coordinate all sorts of university and community college activities that can enhance transfer. Every community college should formalize an office called a transfer center or transfer coordination office. Transfer is too important to be left to drift somewhere around the liberal arts curriculum and the student advising operations.

In summation we thank you for your interest in transfer and for your participation in this meeting. We will continue to be in touch regarding transfer data and operations and we hope you will continue to consult with us.

Further Reading

Bender, Louis W., (Ed.). *Spotlight on the Transfer Function: A National Study of State Policies and Practices.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1990. 78 pp. (ED 317 246)

Bers, Trudy H. "Tracking Systems and Student Flow." *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 1989, 17 (2), 3-7.

Brawer, Florence B. "Bad News/Good News: Collecting Transfer Data." *Community College Review*, 1991, 19 (3), 48-53.

Brawer, Florence B. "The Transfer Issue: Definitions and Data." *Community/Junior College Quarterly of Research and Practice*, 1991, 15 (2), 235-39.

California State Postsecondary Education Commission. *Transfer and Articulation in the 1990s: California in the Larger Picture*. Sacramento, Calif.: The Commission, 1990. 65pp. (ED 338 200) Available from the California Postsecondary Education Commission, 1020 Twelfth Street, Third Floor, Sacramento, CA 98514-3985 (free).

Campbell, Dale F. *Survey of State Directors on Student Transfer Reporting and Analysis.* National Council of State Directors of Community-Junior Colleges, 1990. 16pp. (ED 330 394)

Coleman, Catherine. "Facilitating Transfer: An Issue of the 90's." Paper presented at the Conference of the North Texas Community/Junior College Consortium, Dallas, Tex., November 15-16, 1991. 12pp. (ED 324 445)

Eaton, Judith S., (Ed.). *Faculty and Transfer: Academic Partnerships at Work.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, National Center for Academic Achievement and Transfer, 1992. 93pp. (ED 344 630) Available from the Publications Department FT, American Council on Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036 ($10.00).

Eaton, Judith S. "Three Myths of Transfer Education." *Community, Technical, and Junior College Journal*, 1990, 60 (6), 18-20.

Illinois Community College Board. *Fall 1986 First-Time Community College Student Transfer Study*. Springfield, Ill.: The Board, 1992. 22pp. (ED 344 624)

Fonte, Richard. "The Siren Call of a Single Success Measure." Paper presented at the Annual Summer Institute on Community College Effectiveness and Student Success, Vail, Colo., June 21-24, 1992. 15pp. (ED 346 894)

Holton, James M. *Assessing the Transfer Function: Tracking Down Transfer Students at Frederick Community College. A Report of the Transfer Tracking System and the Successful Transfer Survey*, 1990-91. Fredrick, Md: Frederick Community College, 1991. 43pp. (ED 348 091)

FORD FOUNDATION/
CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES
1993 TRANSFER RATE DATA FORM

	BLACK	HISPANIC	AMERICAN INDIAN	WHITE	ASIAN/ PAC. ISLANDER	OTHER	TOTAL
Line 1 Number of students entering your college in fall 1987 with no prior college experience.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Line 2 Number of fall 1987 entrants with no prior college experience who completed 12 or more semester credits* by spring 1991.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Line 3 Number of the fall 1987 entrants with no prior college experience who completed 12 or more semester credits * and who transferred to senior institutions by fall 1991.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Your Name: _____
College Name: _____
State: _____
Phone: _____
Fax: _____

Return completed form to: Center for the Study of Community Colleges, 1749 Mandeville Lane, Los Angeles, CA 90049

*Quarter credits should be converted to semester credits.